REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 13 March 2003. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1-6, 10, 12-15, 22, 26, 29 and 31 have been amended to clarify the language thereof, and with respect to Claim 1, the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 and 8-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Freedman, U.S. Patent #5,600,313, in view of Hsu, et al., U.S. Patent #6,320,519. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Freedman and Hsu, et al., and further in view of Chou, U.S. Patent #6,445,381. The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c), as being clearly anticipated by Chen, Patent Application Publication #2002/0154097.

Before discussing the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly review the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to a Window keyboard. The keyboard includes a keyboard body having a control circuit therein. The control circuit is one of a single-chip microprocessor or an application specific integrated circuit. The keyboard body has three function key blocks thereon. The three function key blocks include

a File & Clipboard block, an Office block, and an Application-setting block. Each of the function blocks is electrically connected to the control circuit and each has a plurality of function keys respectively corresponding to specific actions in a predetermined software environment. The control circuit generates a pseudo composite-key code responsive to each function key being operated. The pseudo composite-key code is formed by the group of codes consisting of codes representing simultaneous key switch operation, codes representing sequential key switch operation, and combinations thereof to execute the specific actions.

In contradistinction, the Freedman reference is directed to a computer keyboard having a wrist pad, a pointing stick, and a plurality of icon keys. The keyboard is intended to function with "WINDOWS" applications and is provided with three sets of icon keys, a set of command icon keys, a set of static icon keys, and a set of toolbar icon keys. While the icon keys can be programmed, there is no disclosure or suggestion of programming the keys to output pseudo composite-key codes.

The Hsu, et al. reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Freedman. In fact, the Hsu, et al. reference suggests that the Freedman icon keys are programmed with the WINDOWS extended key codes. The Hsu, et al. reference is directed to a keyboard and method for switching key codes utilizing a single modifier key. As disclosed in the

Background, two prior art methods had been utilized to provide additional functions on a keyboard. One method was through the method of hot keys, wherein additional keys were added to a keyboard and such programmed with the WINDOWS extended key code set. Another method was accomplished utilizing composite-key codes, wherein a user must simultaneously press a combination of keys. The hot key scheme discussed in the Background describes the Freedman system. As an alternative, and a teaching away from Freeman, Hsu, et al. provides two sets of key codes associated with each of the standard keys of the keyboard, and utilizes one key, such as the Alt key 15, Ctrl key 16, or Shift key 17, as the modifier key. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest utilizing pseudo composite-key codes as the alternate code set. Thus, the combination of Freedman and Hsu, et al. cannot make obvious the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed.

The Chou reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Freedman and Hsu, et al. The Chou reference is directed to a method for switching a keypad. Here again, hot keys are utilized, keys which are responded to by the output of an extended key code, and not a pseudo composite-key code. Thus, the combination of Freedman, Hsu, et al. and Chou cannot make obvious the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that the Chen reference is Applicant's own co-pending Patent Application. Thus, the reference cannot be prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as the

subject Patent Application was not filed more than one year subsequent to the publication of Applicant's Application referenced by the Examiner. Further, as the Claims of the reference are not identical to those of the subject Patent Application, any issue of double patenting would be of the obviousness-type that may be overcome by a Terminal Disclaimer. Application will provide such a Terminal Disclaimer if the Examiner finds that there is an issue of obviousness-type double patenting.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 12 September 2003

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

DIK/ds